



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/522,326

02/25/2005

Niels Kristian Lund

PATRADE

6949

7590

10/12/2006

James C Wray
1493 Chain Bridge Road
Suite 300
McLean, VA 22101

EXAMINER

ROST, ANDREW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3753

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,326

Applicant(s)

LUND, NIELS KRISTIAN

Examiner

Andrew J. Rost

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 20061002.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 7/11/2006. Claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended. Claims 2, 4 and 8 have been cancelled. Claim 9 has been added. Presently, claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 9 are pending.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the ventilation ring must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 3751

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walter et al. (4,200,121).

Regarding claim 1, Walter et al. disclose a coupling device having a coupling plug-in (10) and a coupling socket body (11) made of a single piece and the coupling socket body having a valve (35), a valve seat (41), a valve spring (39), a seal (40) that seals the valve to the valve seat, locking balls (13), a sleeve (15) and a spring (16) that hold the locking balls and an o-ring (o-ring supports wings 38 in the coupling socket body and in turn retains the valve in the coupling socket body).

In regards to claim 5, Walter et al. disclose the valve having a diameter (taper of cone 42 near the seal 40) larger than a portion of the coupling socket body (valve

Art Unit: 3751

contacts the valve seat 41 and cannot pass through the portion of the coupling socket body with a reduced diameter).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Scyoc et al. (6,354,564).

Regarding claim 6, Van Scyoc et al. discloses a coupling socket that has locking means (ball retaining apertures 21), valve means (a valve 26), connection means visible in Figure 2) with the socket body made of a single piece (the body 10 is of a single construction that houses the valve 26 and supports the ball retaining aperture 12).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jeory (US 2002/0079473 A1).

Jeory discloses connectors and valves having a coupling socket body (110) having a valve (130), a valve spring (132), a seal (136), a valve seat (134), locking balls (144), and a locking release (140) having a spring (142). Jeory discloses the structure having a method of assembly of inserting the valve spring, inserting the valve, arranging a first o-ring (136), arranging a second o-ring (148), having a ventilating ring (raised portion of coupling socket body that contacts the spring 142), having a ball ring (balls 144), having a lock ring (portion of 140 that contacts the balls) and an outer locking ring (remaining portion of 140) with the valve spring, valve the first o-ring and second o-ring being inserted through an opening in the coupling socket body.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. in view of engineering expedient.

In regards to claim 3, Walter et al. disclose a coupling socket body with a valve, valve spring, locking balls with release and an o-ring. Walter et al. do not disclose the valve traveling less than 10 mm. However, it would have been an obvious engineering expedient to size the coupling socket body smaller to reduce the travel distance of the valve and to reduce the amount of material needed for the coupling socket body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reduce the travel distance of Walter et al. as an engineering expedient in order to reduce the size of the coupling socket body and to reduce the amount of material of the coupling socket body.

In regards to claim 9, the modified Walter et al. reference discloses the valve traveling less than 5 mm.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments on page 11, second full paragraph are not persuasive.

Applicant states that claim 6 recites the use of a single piece socket body. As can be seen in Figure 1 of Van Scyoc et al., the coupling socket body (10) is formed from a single piece that supports the valve (26) and the locking balls (20). Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew J. Rost whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 3751


2711. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 - 4:30 M-Th and 7:00 - 12:00 Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on 571-272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Andrew J Rost
Examiner
Art Unit 3751



JUSTINE R. YU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

10/2/06